

EX-U.S. AIDES ASSAIL SOVIET ARMS TREATY

Foes of Pact Say It Would Reduce
Americans to Inferior Military
Role for Years to Come

By RICHARD BURT

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 11 — Several former defense officials and retired military officers attacked the projected strategic arms treaty with the Soviet Union today, asserting that the accord "would lock the United States into a position of military inferiority for years to come" and that Senate ratification would be "exceedingly dangerous and foolish."

Appearing at a news conference, they made public a 62-page study designed to show that the treaty would constitute an "act of phased surrender" to the Soviet Union. The news conference was sponsored by the Coalition for Peace Through Strength, a private organization whose members include over 190 members of Congress.

According to the study, the accord would give the Soviet Union "a nearly 2-to-1 advantage in strategic offensive weapons; a 47-to-1 advantage in strategic defense weapons; a 6-to-1 advantage in missile megatonnage and missile accuracy comparable to the United States."

'Symbol of Defeatist Policies'

"The most important reason for rejecting SALT II," the study said, "is that it is a symbol of defeatist policies which have led to phased surrender by the United States as it retreats around the world in the face of Soviet aggression."

The opponents of the treaty who appeared at the news conference included J. William Middendorf 2d, former Secretary of the Navy; Thomas C. Reed, former Secretary of the Air Force; Adm. Thomas Moorer and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Maj. Gen. George Keegan, former chief of Air Force Intelligence, and Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, former commander of American forces in South Korea who was dismissed by President Carter last year after having criticized American defense policy.

In separate statements, the participants listed what they called flaws in the projected accord and they characterized President Carter's basic policy toward the Soviet Union as "honest, but naive." The general theme of the statements was that the Soviet Union was bent on global conquest and the arms accord would help achieve that goal.

To Counter Brzezinski and Brown

The presentations, evidently designed to counter endorsements of the treaty made last week by Zbigniew Brzezinski, the President's national security adviser, and by Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, included the following criticisms:

"The accord is based on faulty intelligence. General Keegan, the former Air Force intelligence chief, said the Soviet Union was "in the midst of the most extensive war preparations" and the United States had "grossly underestimated" the buildup. He said that, in a nuclear war, Soviet civil defense would limit deaths to five million compared with 160 million fatalities in the United States. He said the Russians had begun work on advanced antisatellite weapons and had stockpiled 5,000 ICBM's.

"The accord would neglect new Soviet systems. Mr. Reed, the former Air Force Secretary, said the treaty would not place strict limits on the Soviet bomber known in the West as Backfire. While the United States contends that the plane has been deployed for use against Western Europe and China, he said, a new model could strike American targets and then land in Cuba without refueling. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, a former commander of American forces in South Korea, criticized the exclusion of a new Soviet intermediate-range missile, the SS-20, from the accord on the ground that it could also be modified to strike at the United States.

"The accord could not be verified. Lieut. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, a former director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, said the loss of electronic listening posts in Iran and the Soviet Union's acquisition of a manual describing an advanced photo-reconnaissance satellite had made it impossible to guard against Soviet efforts to cheat. He said the Government's assurances that the United States could monitor compliance were fraudulent.

"The accord would weaken the Western alliance. General Singlaub, the former commander in South Korea, said the treaty, by weakening American strategic power, would put the allies in Western Europe at the mercy of superior Soviet conventional forces. General Lemnitzer, who is also a former commander of North Atlantic Treaty forces, said the West Europeans were "deeply concerned that SALT II violates the spirit and concept of alliance equality."

Summarizing the statements, Admiral Moorer, the former Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, said:

"After 45 years in uniform, I have never been so concerned about the state of the military balance as I am today. I am not saying that tomorrow we are likely to have Soviet five-megaton warheads raining down upon us. What I am trying to stress to you is the disastrous psychological effect that the Soviet military buildup will have on the American position around the world over the next 10 years."